

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Danny Conrad LaCasse, Jr.)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No. 4:06-2529
)	
Horry County, South Carolina;)	
J. Gregory Hembree, Chief Solicitor;)	
Brad Richardson, Assistant Solicitor;)	
Tom Fox, Director of Horry County)	
Detention Center; and Phillip E.)	
Thompson, Sheriff of Horry County;)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

ORDER

Pro Se Plaintiff Danny Conrad LaCasse, Jr. filed the instant action on September 13, 2006. (Doc. #1). On the same day, he filed the pending motion for a preliminary injunction. (Doc. #3). On November 13, 2006, the Defendants filed their response to the Plaintiff's motion and their own motion to dismiss. (Docs. #14, 15). As the Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, an order pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), was entered on November 14, 2006, advising the Plaintiff of the motion to dismiss and the possible consequences if he failed to adequately respond. (Doc. #16). The Plaintiff filed a response on November 21, 2006, and again on December 18, 2006. (Docs. #21, 26). The Defendants then filed the pending motion for summary judgment on January 24, 2007. (Doc. #30). Another order pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975) was entered on January 25, 2007, advising the Plaintiff of the motion for summary judgment and the possible consequences if he failed to adequately respond. To date, the Plaintiff has not responded to the pending summary judgment motion.

This matter is before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed August 14, 2007 by United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, to whom this matter was previously assigned. (Doc. #42). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends the Plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunction be denied and the Defendants’ motions to dismiss and for summary judgment be granted. Id. No party to this action has filed objections.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation and the relevant filings in this case. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, and in light of no party to this action filing objections to the Report, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED** and the Plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunction is **DENIED** and the Defendants’ motions to dismiss and for summary judgment are **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/ Terry L. Wooten

Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

September 5, 2007
Florence, South Carolina